## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA LYNCHBURG DIVISION

EMERSON CREEK POTTERY INC.	)
Plaintiff,	) Case No.: 6:20-CV-0054-NKM
v.	)
COUNTRYVIEW POTTERY CO., EMERSON CREEK EVENTS, INC., CHRISTINA DEMIDUK, and DAVID DEMIDUK	) ) ) )
Defendants.	) )
Special Interrog	gatories: Breach of License
Question 1	
explicit trademark license agreement, whet	dence that Plaintiff and Defendants entered into an ther written or oral, in which Plaintiff permitted POTTERY trademark with Defendants' services?
Answer yes or no	
If you answer "yes", answer the remaining	questions.
If you answer "no", only answer questions	6, 7 and 8.

## Question 2

Do not answer this question if you answered "no" to question 1.

Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that the licensing agreement included Defendants' use of the EMERSON CREEK, EMERSON CREEK POTTERY, EMERSON CREEK POTTERY & TEAROOM, and/or EMERSON CREEK EVENTS with Defendants' gift shop services?

Question 6	
Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Plainti nature and quality of Defendants' gift shop services and ade of EMERSON CREEK, EMERSON CREEK POTTERY, ETEAROOM, and/or EMERSON CREEK EVENTS with the	equate control over Defendants' use EMERSON CREEK POTTERY &
Answer yes or no	
Question 7	
Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Plainti nature and quality of Defendants' restaurant services and ad of EMERSON CREEK, EMERSON CREEK POTTERY, ETEAROOM, and/or EMERSON CREEK EVENTS with the Answer yes or no	lequate control over Defendants' use EMERSON CREEK POTTERY &
Question 8	
Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Plainti nature and quality of Defendants' events services and adeque EMERSON CREEK, EMERSON CREEK POTTERY, EM TEAROOM, and/or EMERSON CREEK EVENTS with the	nate control over Defendants' use of ERSON CREEK POTTERY &
Answer yes or no	
Date	Signature of Foreperson
	Printed Name of Foreperson